Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/584,216	MASTENBROEK, MARTIN
	Examiner	Art Unit
	COLLEEN M. QUINN	3634
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_
(1) <u>COLLEEN M. QUINN (Examiner)</u> .	(3) <u>Liam McDowell (reg. I</u>	<u>no. 44231)</u> .
(2) Katherine Mitchell (SPE).	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>1 July 2010</u>	Time: <u>11:00AM</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: Foreign Priorty Claim		
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: see continuation sheet		
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 		
/Colleen M Quinn/ Examiner, Art Unit 3634	.pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

The Examiner and her Supervisor called the attorney of record to let him know there appeared to be some mix up in his claim for foreign priority since all copies of submitted foreign documents appear to be directed to an entirely different invention. The Examiner had previously noted thclaim for foreign priority did not appear correct in the first Office action of January 22nd, 2010. In the response filed April 21st, 2010 the applicant's representative responded by saying that the foreign priority to NL 1025127 & NL 1025821 and PCT/NL2004/000894 were indeed correct. The examiner reveiwed the submitted copies again and also went to the WIPO website and EPO website to review the documents cited and realized that the applicant has apparently submitted copies of foreign patent applications that do not correspond with the applications he his claiming foreign priority to. This was explained to Mr. McDowell in the phone call of July 1st, 2010 and he said he would look into it and give the Office a call back. In a return phone call Mr. McDowell left a message for the Examiner saying that he could see the cover sheet of the document submitted and thought only the correct PCT cover sheet was submitted and that he was not sure what documents the Examiner was looking at since the PCT application viewed in WIPO online appeared to be the correct application.